

**DEMOCRACY CORPS  
GROUP 2  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON  
COLLEGE MEN, AGES 32 - 49  
OCTOBER 23, 2001, 8:00 P.M.**

I'm Mark and I'm from Samanish. I sell construction supplies during the day. I'm married with three kids.

I'm Jim and I'm from Woodenville. I have a daughter and a wife. I work as a consultant in accounting work.

I'm Kevin and I live in Littlewood. I have four kids. I work for an oil company that supplies gas to gas stations.

I'm Dave and I'm married with four kids. Live out in Newhall. I'm a customer service manager for Stafford Forms.

I'm Matthew, live in Bellview. Consultant engineer so I'm working the region.

I'm Dave and I'm married. I have a one and a three-year old. I'm an engineer and have grown up in Washington all my life.

I'm Duane and I'm just finishing up having coordinated all the (inaudible) on the new Seahawks Stadium. I'm going to be finished with that in about a month. The stadium is going to open at the end of the year, so we are getting ready for next football season.

I'm William and I'm an IS administrator for U.S. Gypsum. Live in Rutland, lived in Washington for ten years, born and raised in West Virginia.

I'm Jim or James. I grew up in Bellview, live in Mill Creek, work for a company called Clinton Inc. I have four children ranging in age from 18 to 4.

I'm Dan and I'm married with two kids, one five and one three. I'm a consultant, I work in computers. I live in Narcia.

MODERATOR—I THOUGHT WE'D START TALKING ABOUT THE ATTACKS OF SEPTEMBER 11<sup>TH</sup> AND ALL THE THINGS THAT HAVE HAPPENED SINCE THEN. HOW DO YOU THINK THE COUNTRY IS REACTING?

The country or the media?

MODERATOR—THE COUNTRY.

Overall, the country is reacting good. From the parts that I see, before it was like who cared about your neighbors or anything, and now it's like you start to see people who are attempting to pull together a little bit and get this country back to what it was founded upon. People working together for a common goal.

I agree with that. The media is capitalizing on whatever they can find to sensationalize. There's a few extremists, people reacting without thinking, but overall I think the country is doing well.

It's nice to see the resurgence of patriotism. It's unfortunate that it takes an incident such as what happened to bring it about, but people pulling together and people who may never have communicated with each other, there's a closeness, people are bonding.

In this time when tensions can really rise fast, I really appreciate and like the way the administration is taking their time to gather communication with all other concerns, getting the point across about what the counter attacks are for, the retaliation. I like the respectfulness and taking time out from the major sporting events, not just for the safety aspects, but for the respect and the gravity of the situation.

The only thing that we've gone so overboard on is that there is no way they can prevent everything they are trying to prevent. A lot of the stuff we are doing is just....how can you stop every possible thing that could happen. It just seems like we are going a little overboard on that. There's just things you can't do. There's just things that you can't help.

One of the interesting things that bothers me is how some of the stuff is coming back through the media to the people, politicians I heard on a radio station this morning, I wish they'd have some more experts giving the information. I don't know if I would alarm the public more than having politicians release the information, which bothers me. Myself, I've never been very fond of censorship, but I've always...I think the media has been pretty respectful, but there have been some cases where they want to publish information where maybe the public doesn't have a right to know. Things that are there to protect us or could cause problems down the road for situations, police, soldiers, it's a fine line right now as to what is released and how it affects the country.

This was kind of...I was born and raised in Romania, which is in Eastern Europe. It was a communist country and when I came here I defected from Romania. I was not used to hear so much about what is happening when something so big happens like here. I just want to say that I'm very happy that I'm here. Americans are great and I'm one of them. I was surprised how little everybody else was affected by this. If you take any country in Europe, people from other places are treated very bad comparing with here. Like you said, I was very surprised....we have this anthrax problem which is a big problem, and I don't know why the media wants to talk about chicken pox and other stuff, like they are trying to give ideas. That frightens me somehow. We need to talk about something that maybe they don't even have....I mean I don't know, I'm just saying.

They started talking about small pox and I just really didn't need to know about that. On the other hand, I'm pleased at how people have come together. There seems to be fewer instances of road rage. People seem to have gotten their priorities a little better oriented than they had before. There have been some problems, some people attacking the Mosque in the area, some people from the local Christian churches went there to help them out. I think that interaction and what this country stands for is a melting pot of basically everything. It's very reassuring.

I'm not exactly sure where this is going but, one of the interesting things for me was that since I'm in construction, a fellow from New York who is also in construction flew out here a week afterwards, and he was standing on the 40<sup>th</sup> floor, he was the project manager of a 40-story building that is being built in New York right now. He flew in and I met him here and we drove up to Vancouver to meet with a detailing company. That's where I'm going in the next couple of months. And he actually saw the whole thing from the 40<sup>th</sup> floor and described it. It's obviously a lot different to see it with your own eyes, than watching it on TV. One of the interesting things that I think has happened is that the local charity organizations, not just in the greater Seattle area, but all over the United States, so many people have given money to New York. It seems like they have so much money and blood coming in. New York doesn't even need any of that blood. The people that would have needed the blood, they all died. And the money, seems to be drying up right now for the local charities that really need it because so many people have given to New York. That might be hurting the local organizations.

I think we are in a new world. We are going to have to start thinking about things a little differently. We are going to have to start sensing things a little differently. That doesn't mean that we must react, it just means that this is a new world. Pretty much like the people must have sat around a table on Dec. 15<sup>th</sup> or Jan. 10<sup>th</sup> 1942 after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. There were issues that were never thought of or addressed, but because the media exposes it, the media itself is an extremely competitive commercial industry, that is thirsty for any kind of news or novel. They don't know what will sell, but novelty is what they are interested in. The point is that this is a wonderful country. I used to think that this country was pretty much on the decline, manufacturing leaving, with so many jobs moving out, until I realized the greatest strength here is our universities, our knowledge base. People come here from all over the world undisputedly to find institutions here of learning. This gives us an enormous advantage, but also a target obviously of small pox, and I'm sure there's countless others that we don't know about. As much as that causes anxiety, I believe that terrorists and people who want to inflict harm will find those nonetheless, and expose it now. And to give the individuals, anywhere in this country somebody that's sitting somewhere might have a phenomenal idea in how to prevent this, I think it's very powerful. I still think that we are on the losing end and will be for several months, because we are on the back of our heels, we are reacting.

**MODERATOR—THINKING ABOUT THE BIG THINGS IN LIFE AND CHANGE  
(INAUDIBLE)?**

Certainly. Just reminds of how small this world is. How somebody that has effectively, a country that is 2,000 years behind, can create such havoc. It's a small group of people with such far out ideas can affect so many people.

We've looked at the globalization of the world and the world is getting smaller, and it's always been such a good thing for business and the economy and such. Very few people really thought that this could come back and bite us. By making the world a smaller place, we are easier to get to here in this country. We always thought we were oceans away from everybody, but by being such an open country and opening our doors to commerce, it's really opened us up to this.

MODERATOR—WHAT'S IT MEAN TO BE AN AMERICAN?

It means you are free, free to gain your education. You have a lot of infrastructure in which you live. Public roads to your schools, to your postal service, to your public health facilities. By the time you reach grade school, you have more opportunity than you realize. And that's taken a long time to establish, but since this country was founded, we've gotten there just by sheer determination of people in the U.S. the whole time. I don't think it's been created by people that have evil in their hearts, I think they were good, well meaning people.

I think it means...it speaks to me of freedom, it means that I can voice my opinion, I'm free to have this discussion. And that my opinion matters, in that I can vote, people are interested in my opinion. Whereas, the people in Afghanistan don't have an opinion or much of a voice.

Diversity.

Choices. We have the opportunity everyday to make choices in our relationships, our lifestyles. So many countries are not afforded that same opportunity.

MODERATOR--ONE OF THE IMAGES WHICH WE'VE SEEN A LOT MORE OF SINCE THE ATTACKS IS THE AMERICAN FLAG. IN ONE OR TWO WORDS, WHAT COMES TO MIND WHEN YOU SEE THE FLAG?

Home.

Freedom. Choices that other people don't, or are trying to get into this country to have the choice to be able to make the choices that we take for granted. Declaring our freedom. It sounds almost self centered, but I think this is God's chosen country. I'm a religious person and that's the way I see it.

Patriotism.

Respect.

A reminder of who we are as Americans. People who flock for freedom.

MODERATOR—WHY DO YOU THINK ALL OF THIS IS HAPPENING TO THE U.S.?

I think it happened because of our freedoms. We are despised for our ability to make a better life for ourselves. We have had a lot of influence in the world stage and I believe that some people are pretty unhappy for what that has meant.

Part of that is because we have that opportunity, and we feel that everybody should have that opportunity, whether they are American or not. That view is not always taken lightly or favorably in other countries. The ruling parties may not necessarily believe that the population should have that right.

I think part of it has to do with the fact that because we are basically taking the oil from those countries over there, importing it over here, and we are such a wealthy country and we prop up a lot of these governments that are over there, and provide them with military and other aid, and a lot of these other people, the Taliban, most of the people are so poor. Being in poor and desperate countries, it leads to desperation and gravitating toward these kind of radical people.

To some extent, some of it is self inflicted.

Oh sure.

Self destroying themselves. Over time, we all think that we are right and what we believe is best, unfortunately, they feel the same way. It boils down to a few people in control that are afraid they will lose that control.

MODERATOR—LOOKING BACK INSIDE OUR OWN BORDERS, HOW IS THE ECONOMY?

It could be better.

It was already dipping down before this happened, and it will eventually come back pretty strong.

MODERATOR—DO YOU THINK THIS WILL HAPPEN SOON OR WILL IT BE AWHILE?

I think it will happen by next summer.

I went to get shoes at Bell Square for my kids this weekend and you couldn't find a parking spot. That surprised me. The media outlook on the economy, I hadn't been out to the malls much lately, but I was surprised that there were so many people out there.

My wife is in retail. She had retired (inaudible). They talked her into coming back and running the Christmas store at Bellview Square and in the town center. They are expecting a big Christmas this year. Just because, even if they don't have that much money this year, they are going to spend it on Christmas to make themselves feel good.

I think the economy is doing great. I thought after September 11, I thought there would be a problem, especially when we had the World Trade Centers going down, but I think it's okay. Even before, the economy was...I don't know how to say, but it was more like a self inflicting going down economy. The media was presenting all the time that the stock market was going down like 50 points or something, like a crash, but then if it went up another 50 points, they say, well today the market went up. Everything was inflated, I think.

It seems to be and I don't know if we are more insulated here, but everyday you hear about companies laying off 20,000, Boeing 30,000, it seems like a lot of companies are laying off a tremendous amount of people.

They are, so the economy is not doing great, and there's no way that it is doing great.

But, those people haven't been laid off yet. They've gotten their early warnings and stuff like that. It's still coming.

Most of them have until after the first of the year.

But, it certainly seems like there is a large amount of companies...everyday you listen to it and as soon as they announce earnings, it's 20,000 people that are going to get cut. Earnings are down and so we are cutting this bunch of people.

We don't depend on Boeing so much any more. Everybody knows that. There is so much help wanted in the health industry and other industries which people can go to school and change their jobs and go to some other business. I did the same thing. I'm a mechanical engineer, I went to school to learn computers, and now I'm doing computers. I'm not saying...I don't expect those 18,000 people just to stay home. They can stay home for a few months to have fun and collect the unemployment, but then they will have to do something.

On the other hand, the third floor of the building I work at is empty because of the dot coms and every building in the development park that I work in has now got a "for lease" sign in front of it with empty office space. I never saw that in the last six to eight years that I've worked in that area.

That's indicative of a number of things. One is that the dot coms were the ones that could outbid on the commercial space that displaced or competed against others. In historical standards, we are still very strong. Absolutely sector oriented, and if I get \$5 it always feels pretty good, but if I lose \$5, I immediately feel it. I think that we are truly...when you are on the side of a hill and you are slipping down, the scary part is how far you are going to go, not necessarily once we are down there and we start coming back up, it may not be so bad, but part of that is the anxiety of not knowing how many more thousands of jobs or how many people are going to be laid off.

Personally, because of my education, my current job, it's stable for the local manufacturer, but other people close to manufacturing are not safe. They are going out the door before Christmas and for the next six months some of them will be going out the door, until that 30,000 mark is

reached. It could happen to me, but I've saved up, I've taken the advice in my career, and saved up for that inevitable happening. It will take closer to a year to two years to recover. I'm afraid of trying to hold on, but I don't know how far yet.

**MODERATOR—ARE ANY OF YOU CONCERNED ABOUT YOUR OWN ECONOMIC SECURITY?**

I say you create your own opportunities. You look at things and if you are worried about one thing...I've never worked two jobs, but I've never had just one income. I've always done things to get by. The last time we had a recession in an area I was in, great, no problem, I figured out things I could do on the side, things that people needed, so I chose not to participate in any recession. People talk about recession, there's a slump and everything, well I choose not to participate in it. I have a style that I want to keep up and I'll make sure I don't participate in it.

It's like the comment by Ted Turner, that affected me. I feel very fortunate, I've been very conservative, I'm not too concerned. But, with Ted Turner who is a multi billionaire, said that the wolf is still not that far from the door, I think there's something that's (inaudible) that I don't know if the word is "enough", but there's always some sort of sense or concern that you could always create a scenario that you'd get screwed. I think that, yes it will always affect me, partially because I'm sensitive to some other groups, like I see a large number of women that are raising families and struggling. This is a new poverty.

**MODERATOR—(HANDOUTS GIVEN OUT) ON HANDOUT #1, WRITE DOWN ALL THE GOOD THINGS ABOUT GEORGE W. BUSH THAT COME TO MIND. THEN GO TO HANDOUT #2 AND TELL ME YOUR DOUBTS OR WORRIES ABOUT HIM. LET'S TALK ABOUT THE GOOD THINGS FIRST.**

Tax cuts.

Short phrases like the "evil doers."

Great choices for his staff.

Works at building a good team around him.

I like his attitude. Back to the short phrases, "bring him in." Good attitude.

Strong family ties. Constantly surrounded with his Dad, his Mom and family type things.

Seems to be open and informative, seems to want everybody to know what's going on.

He let's you know when you don't need to know that. Which is fine.

The media keeps pressing and he's like, "we are not telling you. There's some things that have to stay confidential." That's the way it is. He's very straightforward with them and frank. He's going to tell you what you need to know and no more than that. You may be curious about the rest, but you don't need to know anything.

He's not intimidated. His communication with America.

He's a quiet, determined leader.

I like that he's religious. He knows what he wants. He knows exactly what he wants.

Decisive.

Personality and character. I think he comes across as being genuine.

He's not afraid to show his emotion. He showed it at the right time. And then, when he had to be strong, he's been strong also.

MODERATOR—LET'S GO TO HANDOUT #2. WHAT ARE YOUR DOUBTS?

His perception by other world leaders. I don't know if he is respected by the rest of the world that well.

I put down that same thing. Some of the worries that I had have been kind of abated somewhat by how he is handling things since 9/11.

He's extremely focused on what he wants and that's a positive, but it can also be a negative because there's always a little bit of give and take. If you stay focused totally on what you have, people seem to not respect inflexibilities. That's one of the things that concerns me a little bit.

There's a huge difference between a politician and a statesman. Times like this require a statesman, but that's not necessarily what gets you re-elected. I'm concerned, not necessarily know, but I'm concerned with the speech he made the other day, originally, was awe inspiring, it was tremendous. It has to do down as one of the finest speeches ever, however now the part that concern me is, is he able to carry it all through.

Possibility that he may be swayed too much with public opinion instead of following through with what he knows to be the right thing to do. Not necessarily the majority of people, but the vocal majority decide that they want to go another way, will he be swayed by that because of political ties.

This is probably an unpopular opinion, but the biggest thing for me is that the economy, as far as the tax cuts and things, I thought he is going overboard on that. My biggest concern is the deficit because the deficit.....we are paying so much interest on the deficit itself, that if we keep cutting back on it.....we were on a great path to get this knocked down to a reasonable level, if not

eliminate the damn thing altogether. But, the more you keep getting away from it, to keep the expenses down and pay the damn thing off, and it just seems like it is going the other direction.

I'm in agreement there. How will the national debt be paid off? The past administration had a nine-year plan to have it paid off and that was impressive to me.

My concern is exactly the opposite, that he didn't go far enough, give people more money and they'd spend it. Spending creates taxes.

I'm going to go back to where you said you chose not to participate in a recession, and I firmly believe that that's exactly what a recession is. It is caused by people that decide to participate. They are afraid of one, so they create one. Recession is people holding money instead of spending it. If enough money want to hold it, it doesn't matter how much tax money you give them back, they are still going to hang onto it. They will create a recession with or without a tax cut.

Loss of government programs that establish help for people who lose their jobs or need retraining programs. If the tax base isn't coming in, are there cuts being made in programs which give people a way to go to retrain?

**MODERATOR—DO YOU TRUST BUSH OR NOT TO HANDLE THE ECONOMY?**

I'm concerned that he is not paying as much attention as it really needs.

There might be a silver lining in what's happened, in a very terrible way, but it is nonetheless true. What happened to bring us out of the great depression was WWII. There could be, and this may or may not happened, especially if this is something that's kept small, but there's all sorts of things that could generate the economy. Certainly, military. In fact for a long time, this country only knew prosperity because of a war, Korea or Vietnam. And in fact, a lot of economists after Vietnam were concerned, because that was the engine that drove this country. The other side of that is that I think this may be bigger than what Bush can control directly, anyhow. Though he has some key people, and Greenspan is more than....time will only tell, but he could either be tremendous and looked back upon as being one of the finest people to manage the economy, or he will be another Herbert Hoover. Only time will show.

For the most part, yeah. He hasn't screwed anything up too bad yet, which is a good sign.

His experience. He hasn't been in office long enough for any of us to really know what's down the path. And so, that goes hand in hand with the economy, it's nice to get your little rebate back, enjoy it now. I do have concerns about what the future....think back to all the campaign promises and his direction, what he was going to do with the programs and stuff like that, I don't know how long this whole latest incident is going to detour a lot of those programs and plans. It will be interesting to see.

I'm just afraid we will get back into the same thing we had before when you get the deficit so high, it's the second largest expense that we have got, just paying interest on the darn deficit, and we keep talking about tax cuts and a recession and all this other stuff, just leave it alone, it will come back on its own, just let it go and it will be fine. Don't increase the taxes, cut the expenses and.....I don't think he's going to cut the programs that he needs to cut and they are going to decrease the.....give all the money back to the wealthy and not so wealthy, the little bit of rebate that you got is not enough to make any difference.

I trust Bush, I don't trust the Congress and Senate. There's too much political engine running there, so no matter what one person sees, he may be the one who takes the blame for everything, but he's not the one who creates everything. The other guys are the ones who go in and drive the engines and create the spending. The biggest thing that I think they have to do is decrease the spending. You have so much waste going on everywhere, but everyone wants to keep the money funneling to their buddy over here who has this wheat farm or.....

**MODERATOR—DO YOU THINK DEMOCRATS ARE AS PATRIOTIC AS BUSH AND THE REPUBLICANS?**

Sure.

Oh yeah.

Yes.

There's no difference.

Patriotism doesn't follow party lines.

Before 9/11 if you had a crazy guy burning the flag on the street, you could find many Democrats saying, well, it's not so nice, but the guy has the right to do so. Well, I think right now, it would not be appropriate for somebody to burn the flag on the street.

However, the beauty of this country is not.....obviously the majority is the opinion, but because we allow the person to burn that flag on the street, or say those terrible things and actually, I'd be the first in line to want to send him out of the country, if they hate this country, please leave us. But, at the same time, realize that this is what makes us so powerful, such incredible....to tolerate that.

**MODERATOR—SHIFTING GEARS, USE YOUR IMAGINATION AND IMAGINE THAT GOING BACK TO LAST NOVEMBER, GEORGE BUSH HAD NOT WON THE PRESIDENCY. INSTEAD, IT WAS JOHN MCCAIN WHO HAD BEEN ELECTED. ALL THE SAME THINGS HAPPENED. HOW DO YOU THINK MCCAIN WOULD HAVE HANDLED THINGS DIFFERENTLY?**

(inaudible)

Probably more fanatical.

Make sure that you punish the right people before, but he probably would have done it differently.

Before the election or before it happened, I would have said that McCain would have handled it much better, but as it came down, Bush has handled it great, and I think it's because of the people he's got around him.

That's what makes a president great.

Just depends on who he would have had around him. The guys on the team.

MODERATOR—SAME QUESTION, BUT INSTEAD OF JOHN MCCAIN, AL GORE?

I don't think he has enough personality to rally the country. You'd have more protests, anti-war protests. I don't think he could pull off what Bush did.

I don't think he would have been as good at putting together a coalition of countries to support us as well. He doesn't seem very strong in that regard.

He had a fairly good ability to work with foreign countries, possibly more so than working with Americans. He might have put a coalition together, but I don't think it would have done the same thing. I don't think he's got the backbone to support a long-term military objective.

He would have tried to sell them arms for campaign contributions.

Al Gore makes a good president in good times. I'm very glad that we have this administration during bad times.

That's funny you said that because my wife said the exact same thing. I think he would have been okay, but he wouldn't have been as good.

MODERATOR—SAME EXERCISE, BUT WHAT IF BILL CLINTON WERE STILL PRESIDENT?

(inaudible) take some action for your country.

He's a real charismatic type guy so I think he would have gotten the country behind him. He would have handled it like Bush is doing.

I think you are right. He is very charismatic, and I think he would have probably done somewhat better.

I think he would have come out smelling like a rose.

He would have handled it great, come out smelling like a rose, but I don't think...the military operations we had while he was in office, and I'm not a big political fan, I don't study it, but it was almost like he'd send a little bit in, slap people's hands and then pull back out. He wasn't willing to commit to really go in and change things. He was willing to send things out and get the good media blitz, and not finish it.

Scold them and say, don't do it again.

Give them a little hand slap.

I could be wrong to say that's my perception. He wouldn't have been as genuine.

I think most of the things that Clinton did, he did for the media, and not for the final result. Everything was to look good in the media, do it just enough so that you would get the good media, you'd get the good photo op, but don't follow it through to the point where people say, this is going on too long, we've still got to do it.

If he would have been able to jump in and take care of something, we probably wouldn't be in the situation we are in now. None of this would have gotten to the stage where you have a madman over there that has this much control in the world arena. All this stuff has been brewing for 10 or 12 years, if he would have taken care of this years ago, and taken steps, covert actions, you wouldn't have a madman in this area of the world that has so much power. If this guy was knocked down ten years, he wouldn't have grown in stature and power to be able to do this.

**MODERATOR—I WANT TO GO BACK TO GORE BEING PRESIDENT AGAIN. THINKING ABOUT ALL THE OTHER ISSUES STILL HERE AT HOME, HOW WOULD GORE HAVE BEEN HANDLING THINGS DIFFERENTLY THAN BUSH?**

He's be for everybody right now and telling them we need a big tax increase to be able to support all this spending that the government is going to have to do.

I don't know if that's true. He was looking for economic...he was not for tax cuts, he was for fiscal responsibility, and in some ways, I think that's what helped elect Bush, was the potential tax refund. He was also supportive of a lot of projects and causes, so that makes it very dangerous.

I'm not a political expert, so I don't know all the ins and outs.

If a House or a Senate bill came up that would provide for retraining money for a sector that is going through a downturn, more support would have been there.

Republicans tend to support industries better in economic recessions. Democrats tend to support programs that support individuals better. I'm not sure he would have been all that supportive as far as industries. This is such an incredible period.....

I think he would have handled it very similar, as far as...I think they would have kept a rein on the expense, I don't think it would have been outrageous. I think it would be real similar, but you wouldn't have the tax cuts, so you'd have that money available. But, you'd be working on a plan to keep the deficit where it was at. I don't think there was that big a difference as far as that.

On the home front, he may have actually done a little better. Or put more attention to what's happening at home. Possibly to draw attention away from what's happening overseas.

**MODERATOR—IS BUSH PAYING ENOUGH ATTENTION TO WHAT'S GOING ON AT HOME?**

I think he's paying enough, considering what else is going on. His attention is focused now, and he's not ignoring what's going on at home, but he's paying attention where he sees the need.

I think his attention is properly balanced at the moment.

It's so hard to say, I have no idea how he could do things differently. Clinton is a very smart man. People say that he comes out smelling like a rose, but that's because he's a very smart man. I think he could have handled things at least technically, extremely well. What he would have done as far as long term, is truly questionable. I think in the short term, I don't think he would have delivered the kind of speech that Bush did, which I think has a profound effect on rallying the people.

**MODERATOR—ANYBODY ELSE ON CLINTON?**

Going back to the whole Timothy McVeigh thing, when that first happened, and Clinton's thing was, punishment will be swift and severe. And it took his administration and our own justice system over six years before anything ever came of it. I look back at that and try to judge how he would have....in the public opinion and personality and things, he probably would have done well.

He has the public following, and the public support at the time he needed it.

I don't know.

**MODERATOR—I WANT TO TALK ABOUT A FEW ISSUES HERE AT HOME. THE FIRST ONE IS ENERGY POLICY. WHAT'S GOING ON WITH ENERGY POLICY?**

They are getting pretty excited about the energy cell system that could be used for cars, which is the hydrogen and everything. What a perfect thing for the terrorists to go after if that really

came into play. I could see some kind of a hydrogen gas station or something. All they'd have to do is blow that up and they'd blow up a couple of city blocks or something, so maybe that's not such a good thing after all.

I think there's a big difference between the hydrogen projection and a hydrogen bomb. I think they are very different. The fusion energy in that is enormously complicated.

I really question the idea of on a national policy where we would be migrated to leaving it as an open market and having competitive energy companies competing....

(end of side)

I'm not sure if that is something that is in the country's best interest.

You are talking about deregulation?

Yes. Selling tires is one thing, selling electricity is something quite different, and I think we are starting to learn our lesson with what has happened in California which what just transpired this last winter.

I agree. There's something very wrong in taking something that so many people depend on to heat their houses, to keep the lights on and have people be able to make tons of money profiting off it....I have some friends who bought some generators out in Eastern Washington and I was selling them diesel to power them, and they were making tens of thousands of dollars a month last spring selling power back. The cost of diesel is so much less. So many people are fighting to pay their bills and certain individuals can make such phenomenal returns on it, it just seems like that's not really a commodity. That's more like water. It needs to be regulated a little better. It's something that so many people depend on for living, to heat your houses and stuff, someone needs to take another look at it. It's not soda pop and cars.

For so many years, we haven't had new energy sources come along and I think a lot of the new factories need to be put on fast track. We've got nuclear energy plants here in Washington state that just sit there and haven't been doing anything. Why didn't they finish them years ago? Let's just sit back and let the population explode, they don't notice the population is growing? They could have been planning years ahead and looking at this saying, down the road we are going to have these things, increased demands. We may not have been able to predict other things with all the Internet and computers, but they could have come a bit closer than they are now. To me, I look at it as a way for another tragedy to come in and the government will ride in on their little white horse and say, we are the solution to everything. We'll control it, we'll run all the power plants and you can buy from us because we run everything else we do so good. That's my cynical way of looking at it, but they've got to put stuff on the fast track. I'm a climber, I'm an environmentalist, but we need power, get it to us.

The deregulation is what started the problem. The private individuals that own the power generators could say, geez, we don't build any more, we are going to be able to get a fortune for

our power down the road. Why should we build more because we can make more money by not having power.

Partial deregulation was the problem. Go one way or the other, don't go in the middle.

Government needs to be involved in the infrastructure that everyone relies on. Just because everyone relies on it. We do not want a supply and demand problem where people make quick profit because the supply has gotten screwed up.

Hundreds of people are being left go at aluminum plants because financially it makes more sense for them to sell the power back and not run the plant, and let all these people go, than it does to keep it going. I don't get it.

In the same sense, a lot of industry will not invest in power plants because their return on investment may be 20 years. For the country it makes sense, for the company it may not.

It needs to fall in a category like roads.

Oh yeah. Absolutely.

And bridges, all infrastructure.

What do you feel about drilling as far as in Alaska or Texas?

Up until the energy crisis here a little while ago, after all the years I spent in Alaska fishing, I said don't touch that area. With all this uncertainty that you have with potential oil supplies, drill. That's been a change for me within the last six months or so.

I was reading an article on that today and what surprised me was that such a small area of land would actually be touched in order to drill in the national wildlife refuge up there. It changed my opinion on it. The doomsday story I was hearing was that the entire area would be laid to waste, when actually it's an extremely small fraction.

I think they should at least do the exploration so they know what's there.

I don't think there's enough information one way or the other to say. It is such a small little teeny area and Alaska is so huge, it really doesn't make that much difference, but I don't know that we have enough information to say that.

With the new technology they have for drilling, sideways, you know. They can drill a couple miles this way or that way.

There's not much of a footprint that they are going to leave anywhere. I'm not opposed to that at all.

MODERATOR—NEXT ISSUE. HEALTH CARE. WHAT'S GOING ON WITH THIS?

That's one that the politicians really know how to cover. It's been very politically charged and unsavory. We have been trying to have some sort of coordinated national health care policy and we are further from it now than we've ever been. And costs are only escalating. I do most of my work in engineering companies that are associated with products in the medical field. The short-term future doesn't look very good.

Health care sucks. I took my daughter who is 5 ½ and she had a small cavity in one of her front teeth, which she will lose in four or five months. It cost me \$880. The insurance paid \$600 and I paid \$200 and some, but I thought it was a big rip off. I wrote that doctor twice to try to explain why it cost so much. I was ready to go further like the Better Business Bureau and then I said, I'm not going to do too much because I have no chance to win. Health care is going to be a big problem for the next ten years. There's going to be a time when people are going to wake up and say, enough is enough. When anybody has health insurance right now, you are talking about \$600 for a family.

When you go back to costs, if you look at it, the U.S. has the best medical in the world. People come here from all over to get the best care. But, we are going to have to make a decision. Is that going to be available to everyone? There is a point where it is going to get too expensive. It is already. It's terrible.

I work for a small company and our insurance rates keep going up and up and up. There's only a few of us and there's only a couple insurance companies that will even insure small companies. It's nuts, and it's because of the cost of the health care. Somebody has to look into it, what is the real cost of health care. We may have the best health care in the world, but we are going to rapidly get to the point where people can't afford it.

We haven't had much public discussion. We should have a concerted effort, a national commission, aside from what else is going on, just to look at some of the potential ideas, and to promote those ideas. At least give people an idea of what potential choices we might have.

The health care companies are going broke over the last couple years. Some of the smaller ones and medium sized ones. They just can't survive. We've got the problems with the drug companies, making multi million dollars on.....they are making too much money, so there's all these different little areas that seem to be unfair. It's a major problem.

My wife's family, they are retired, but they go to Mexico and they go two times a year, because they can get the drugs that they need, at about half or less than here.

That's ridiculous.

That's true and it happens also in Canada.

Those drugs are made in the USA. People there are making a profit too.

They say that the US funds the research for the rest of the world, except that we can't afford to buy them here.

There's a number of issues here and I agree, even stocks if you look at the companies that are drug manufacturers. They have just done phenomenally well. There is a balance, and we need to find that balance.

Somebody is making a killing on the Cipro for the anthrax.

That's Bayer.

There's nothing to compete against so they set the price.

**MODERATOR—WHAT ABOUT ECONOMIC POLICIES HERE IN THE US?**

I like a strong independent, somebody that is not politically appointed or he has a separate position. He's in a pivotal position and his only job in life is the economy, trying to nudge it in a direction. That's extremely powerful, that's where we are unlike any other nation in the world.

The economic policy has to be somehow to stimulate businesses to keep investing in new technology and equipment, things to keep driving the economy forward. One of the things that businesses tend to do in times like this is retract, and not invest as much in the new technology, and that just goes to conk on to a slower and potential recession. I'm a person who people can probably tell, I'm for minimal taxes, get the government out of everything that they don't need to be into. You've got to encourage businesses through tax breaks or whatever to keep driving.

I agree. The best stimulus for economy is small business, not big business. Big business has a tendency to drop back all the time. Small business is innovative and it grows fast.

The right economic policies are in place. The unfortunate positive consequences of what's going on in the world at the moment. I think it's distracting and actually if we don't fiddle with the economy too much, it will take care of itself. Particularly with Greenspan making money so cheap for investing in product or company improvements. If we do this, we can make this product cheaper than our competitor, and that stuff will kick off and start moving things along.

What happened last year was that currency, and a lot of this has to do with the futures that are traded on currencies, currencies are just another commodity on the market, and ever since the U.S. left the gold standard (inaudible), it effectively changed the world. I think there should be some policy to prohibit or limit the amount that traders can, not just necessarily on our own currency but potentially on other country's currency, what traders all over the world invent can do to a currency. This can devalue and forcing that country to economic chaos. I don't know. The solution is on there, but people will find a way to make money and work much faster than they could ever, but the government is going to work to try and manage that, and I think we are a long ways from doing that. This is very much in our connected world.

I think the economic policy is a small portion of it right now. It's drying up the funds of any of the terrorist groups. That's an economic policy, and up until this point, that would have been impossible. That would have been unheard of. Even the Swiss Banks are approachable.

We tried to do that with Iran when they took hostages, we did freeze Iranian funds and securities here.

**MODERATOR—THINKING ABOUT THE CONGRESS, ARE DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS TAKING THE RIGHT STEPS TO REBUILD AND RESTORE OUR ECONOMY, WITHOUT HURTING US IN THE LONG RUN?**

What steps?

I think we have seen some things, but....

What has passed, there's a question currently what the tax refunds or the aid to the airlines, but a lot of lawmakers either passed it without truly understanding the full bill, or there were things that were added to the bill that added to the expense and money and not necessarily had any effect to the airlines. I don't know what they are doing actually right now.

I think they should just leave it alone, not screw with anything. Just sit back. Unless they do something for a tax credit to invest in new equipment, new plants, stuff like that, that would be great, but....

They passed two huge bills recently, essentially giving Bush 40 billion dollars in discretionary funds. Most of it was for the current war and I don't have a problem with that. The bill still was 3 inches thick.

**MODERATOR—WHICH PARTY DO YOU WORRY MORE THAT THEY'LL DO THE WRONG THING?**

The one that's in control.

As long as they continue to argue between Democrats and Republicans, either one is equally likely to screw up. They spend more time paying attention to which party they belong to than what's right for America, or who should get credit for this wonderful thing that we might do. Is it a Republican idea, is it a Democratic idea, they'll argue with the months before they'll even consider letting it help America.

The control is so close in the Congress.

I'd say the Democrats because the Republicans tend to support business more than the Democrats. The Democrats would be more likely to muck it up for the near term. And push recovery farther out.

But then you can't knock what the Democrats have done over the last 8 years.

Yeah, but it started with Clinton. Arguably, the recession we are in, was well in place before Bush came in.

I don't want to argue with you. One thing that has happened, however, is that if we consider this the center, for a long time we were swung more towards the left, and that's where the idea of the liberal Democrat was running loose. Things had swerved too far to the left, and now I see things to be a little more towards the right, and actually may be coming back towards the center. That's where most of the politicians have found success in a centralist's view. I think that a lot of the Republicans, some of the better Republicans, successful Republicans and successful Democrats are really not very far apart.

**MODERATOR—WHAT DO YOU THINK THE POLITICIANS IN CONGRESS SHOULD SEE AS THEIR PRIMARY OBLIGATION?**

Economic well being.

Economic.

I don't think you can forget about safety if there were issues that they needed to address or could address. When you say primary, does that mean time or their focus?

**MODERATOR—THEIR FOCUS.**

As long as the president is able to maintain the security and do what he is doing, then I agree, they can focus on the...

I agree with that, but if the terrorism thing is so new and it's taking such center stage right now, that's the main focus.

They should be (inaudible) for the country. There are agencies in place that should be addressing the safety issue, the security. The Congress needs to be looking down the road at our economic well being.

I think Congress should be focused on the economy. The president should be focused on the events that are happening.

**MODERATOR—GO TO HANDOUT #3. THIS IS A LIST OF DEMOCRATIC PROPOSALS ON THE ECONOMY.**

**EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS BY 13 WEEKS FOR THE UNEMPLOYED IN HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS.**

COVERING AT LEAST HALF OF THE COBRA HEALTH CARE INSURANCE FOR THOSE LOSING THEIR JOBS FOR UP TO ONE YEAR.  
FUNDING "READY-TO-GO" CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS, SUCH AS IMPROVEMENTS TO AIRPORT AND GROUND WATER FACILITIES, WHICH WILL CREATE JOBS WHILE STRENGTHENING OUR INFRASTRUCTURE AND SECURITY.  
TAX REBATES OF UP TO 4600 FOR THE 40 PERCENT OF AMERICANS WHO FILED TAXES, BUT DID NOT RECEIVE A TAX REBATE THIS SUMMER.  
TAX INCENTIVES FOR BUSINESSES TO ENCOURAGE INVESTMENT THIS YEAR IN NEW PLANTS AND EQUIPMENT.  
DELAY THE TAX CUT FOR THE WEALTHIEST ONE PERCENT OF AMERICANS - THOSE EARNING MORE THAN \$375,000 A YEAR - TO ENSURE NO MONEY IS BORROWED FROM THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND TO PAY FOR TAX CUTS.

WHAT ARE YOUR REACTIONS TO THEM?

I like them all.

I like the ready-to-go construction projects. That makes a great deal of sense to do that.

Extending unemployment, we are one of the only countries that rewards people for not working. I totally disagree with that. That doesn't make sense for me because that encourages people to stay on unemployment.

They can put the money into job training or job placement programs. Or relocation programs.

It does say high unemployment areas. I'm tempted to think that if it's a high unemployment area you are forcing the person to move, which may not be all that trivial. And giving him an opportunity if they wanted to work.

It may be enough that I'm willing to move. To open up the market.

It's easier said than done.

Incentives to encourage businesses to invest. That's good. I like that.

Delaying tax cuts to the wealthy, that sounds good to me.

I agree 100% with that. Just the fact of the tax cut itself. The deficit was....

MODERATOR—ON THAT IDEA, MAKING SURE NO MONEY IS BORROWED FROM THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND, SHOULD THAT BE A PRIORITY FOR THEM?

Yeah.

Yes.

But it's not going to happen.

Part of those moneys are gone already.

I like the Cobra insurance.

I liked it too.

It goes along with the health care issue. That can be a double edged sword too, because it can encourage our monthly premiums to be increased. You go for what the public can bear to pay.

That's why the government is paying half.

I think that gets more into government controlling and deciding exactly which health care you get, and then go to Canada and see how many of them actually come down here for severe medical treatments because they are on a waiting list up there. If government gets involved in it, then they choose....

**MODERATOR—HOW MANY OF YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH COBRA?**

It's a continuation of your existing health care provided by the company.

(many talking at once)

The employee pays 100%, the company doesn't pay one dollar. You just send the money to the company, but you pay 100% of the premium.

That's right.

The company has no interest to increase it.

The health care insurance company sets the premium.

Isn't it a maximum of 18 months?

Yeah.

My wife just received her papers today and it said something about 33 months.

It used to be like 18 months.

The government can certainly do it longer. Was she working for a public company?

No.

Well, maybe just a very good organization then.

I was amazed.

MODERATOR—LET’S GO TO HANDOUT #4 AND TALK ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN PROPOSALS.

CUTTING THE CAPITAL GAINS TAX RATE FOR THE SALE OF STOCKS.

CUTTING THE CORPORATE TAX RATE FROM 35 PERCENT TO 25 PERCENT.

ACCELERATING BY TWO YEARS TAX CUTS THAT WERE PART OF THE BUDGET

PASSED EARLIER THIS YEAR SO THAT SINGLES MAKING OVER \$27,000 AND

COUPLES MAKING MORE THAN \$45,000 RECEIVE A TAX CUT THIS YEAR.

ADDITIONAL TAX CUTS FOR BUSINESSES TO RELIEVE THEIR FINANCIAL

PRESSURE, INCLUDING \$25 BILLION IN PAYMENTS TO COMPANIES SUBJECT TO THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.

EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR THOSE WHO LOST THEIR JOBS AFTER SEPTEMBER 11<sup>TH</sup>.

\$13 BILLION IN TAX REBATES TO THE 30 MILLION WORKERS WHO INCOMES

WERE TOO LOW TO ENTITLE THEM TO THE REBATES THAT OTHER TAXPAYERS RECEIVED THIS YEAR.

WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THEM?

A lot of this has to do with taxes doesn’t it?

I don’t think cutting the corporate tax rate is very good.

Is that just a blanket? There are some very wealthy corporations and there are some corporations that could really use it. A blanket, absolutely not.

The tax cut is tied into investment to encourage them to move forward, not just a blanket.

And cutting the capital gains tax rate, that doesn’t...

That’s not the problem right now because taxes are...

(many talking at once)

There’s not going to be a big gain for now.

I don’t know if that’s true.

There’s lots of money there.

Not only that but, when it says we benefit the person who buys the stock instead of buying real estate or art or something else, why is it only the sale of stocks, and it's also saying that because the stock market is down, we are going to try and relieve some of the....because we did the mistake of investing in the stocks that somehow we want to offset some of the losses. I don't necessarily go with that either.

None of these are really ringing my bell.

I would say accelerating the tax cut by two years, that should have been done in the first place anyway. Extend unemployment benefits, no way. You are encouraging people, even those people who lost their jobs after Sept. 11<sup>th</sup>, you are still encouraging to stay on unemployment and rewarding them for being unemployed.

They are using that date as an excuse.

Yeah.

I liked the Democratic ones better.

So, who is paying your bill?

MODERATOR—I WISH I KNEW. THEY DON'T TELL ME SO THAT I CAN'T PUSH YOU ONE WAY OR ANOTHER.

It's amazing how these do stand out though. I would tend to want to think that they are almost reversed. Whoever wrote these, most people would be hard to be impressed by the Republican, and not impressed by the Democrat. I'm not saying that the Democrats are all...

MODERATOR—HOW MANY WOULD SAY YOU PREFER THE DEMOCRATIC ONES? ALL OF YOU? NOW, LOOKING AT ALL 12 OF THESE INDIVIDUAL POINTS, WHAT ONE WOULD YOU SAY IS THE BEST IDEA?

Construction projects.

Yeah.

Tax incentives to businesses encouraging them to invest.

That's good too.

Delay the tax cut to the wealthiest.

I don't know dollars there, and I don't think it's very big, but it's certainly a win-win.

I'm not even close to that, so I don't know.

I like the tax incentives to invest in new plants.

Me too.

Even with that, if you don't have the capacity or the orders to go ahead and do anything, maybe it's not really anything that will do a whole lot. If you are laying people off, are you really going to invest money into more equipment when you already have....

If you know it's real money that they will save by the tax cut, and if it's temporary, as much as you don't want to spend the money, you would spend the money because you are getting a big sale on it.

Down times are actually a good time to retool too. If your plant is running at 100% capacity, are you going to throw one line off line to redo it? No. But, if you are running at 75% capacity, now is the time to go in and retool.

MODERATOR—GO TO HANDOUT #5. SINCE THE ATTACKS, THERE HAS BEEN AN UNUSUAL AMOUNT OF BI-PARTISANSHIP AND COOPERATION IN CONGRESS. AS OLD ISSUES EMERGE, OLD DIFFERENCES TEND TO EMERGE. WE ARE GOING TO READ ONE MESSAGE FROM REPUBLICANS AND ONE FROM DEMOCRATS. THEN I WANT YOU TO TELL ME WHICH ONE YOU AGREE WITH MORE.

REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS SAY THAT THE LESS DEPENDENT WE ARE ON OIL FROM THE MIDDLE EAST, THE MORE SECURE OUR NATION IS. WE NEED TO INCREASE DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF OIL, COAL, AND NATURAL GAS. OUR NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIRES THAT WE OPEN ALASKA'S ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE TO OIL DRILLING, SUBSIDIZE THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW, CLEAN, COAL TECHNOLOGY, AND BUILD NEW POWER PLANTS.

DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS SAY WE NEED AN ENERGY SECURITY PLAN THAT REDUCES OUR RELIANCE ON OIL FROM THE MIDDLE EAST. WE NEED TO USE AMERICA'S TECHNOLOGICAL KNOW-HOW TO DEVELOP NEWER, CLEANER ENERGY SOURCES, SUCH AS WIND AND SOLAR, AND TO BUILD ENERGY EFFICIENT CARS AND APPLIANCES. WE CAN SECURE OUR ENERGY SUPPLY USING CLEAN FUELS LIKE NATURAL GAS, BUT WITHOUT DRILLING FOR OIL IN THE PRISTINE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.

HOW MANY PICK THE REPUBLICAN ONE? 5. HOW MANY WITH THE DEMOCRATIC ONE? 5. WHAT DO YOU LIKE OR NOT LIKE ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN ONE?

I like it because it's something which can be realized. Democrats talk about wind and solar but we know solar is very expensive, it's not efficient, and wind is wind. It doesn't blow all the time. Building efficient cars is not going to solve our problem.

I think an essential part now is to explore an drill the Arctic. Not necessarily open it wide open, but at least get that there. And the last thing, and oh and by the way, subsidize the development of new clean coal technology, that puts it at the end, and says this is in there also. Open up the Arctic and still subsidize and keep people working towards the alternatives also.

This will create many jobs in our country. Drilling in Alaska, by using more coal.

Building more power plants is not a small proposition. It will create some jobs.

I didn't like opening up the national wildlife refuge area, without any plans for it.

You can't say just a little bit. Once you open it up, it's opened up. Once the genie is out of the bottle, however the only reason I am supporting the Republican point of view is that at this particular time, it's that we do want to remind the Middle Eastern countries, OPEC nations, that so many of them are being supported by this country. If there is an idea that the markets...we say we don't need you any more, or at least cut back, that's a very powerful message, and I think that will help us dramatically.

I don't like it saying that our national security requires, I don't think that's the case.

I have a problem with it not being very far reaching. It's time to start looking at solar power, and if you don't start...let's face it, still there's a lot of oil and coal, but it's a nonrenewable resource. It is going to run out. The sooner we start looking at it, the less dependent we are on it. 100 or 200 or 300 years down the road, the better off we are. We should start it now. Otherwise, it will be more expensive later. If you start doing the research now, you build a foundation for the future.

I'm supporting the Republican ones because the reading and the research that I've been doing, we know that we are looking into wind and solar, and one of the things that irritates me about the California situation, is that they've got some wind powered plants down there that don't have sufficient transmission lines to them. They can't even run at capacity. I think that that would be balanced, even though it doesn't read that way in a short paragraph.

**MODERATOR—LET'S TALK ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC ONE.**

I like going after more energy efficient cars. There's got to be some way to make them way more energy efficient. Just the idea of going after alternative power sources.

They certainly can make cars and appliances more energy efficient. You just have to like that idea.

There's technology that has the ability to make things more efficient.

As long as we are dependent on oil, we are going to be back in the same place that we are today. I think long-term the Democratic proposal is something that we are going to have to embrace.

That's the reason I don't like...I don't like either one of them really, but in order to reduce our dependence, we are going to need to do some of the coal technology, the new clean technology, where I don't really think that's the way we need to go, but I think there should be a solar panel on every roof now. Or just something. I don't understand why there can't be something that just as a national policy that we are going to do this technology, we've got every rooftop, that could reduce....I know it's not economically, it's got to be big, to be economically feasible. That's going to take some research and time, it's not there yet.

MODERATOR—NEXT HANDOUT.

DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS SAY WE NEED TO DELAY TAX RATE CUTS PASSED EARLIER THIS YEAR FOR THE WEALTHIEST ONE PERCENT TO PREVENT BORROWING FROM THE MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS. THEY SAY THIS IS THE ONLY WAY WE CAN MEET OUR IMMEDIATE NEEDS - REBUILDING AFTER THE TERRORIST ATTACKS, EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR THOSE LAID OFF IN THE WAKE OF THE ATTACKS, FUNDING NEW SECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS, AND INCREASING EDUCATION SPENDING - WITHOUT SACRIFICING MILLIONS OF AMERICANS' LONG TERM SECURITY.

REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS SAY WE NEED TO EXPAND ON THE TAX CUTS PASSED EARLIER THIS YEAR IN ORDER TO GIVE MONEY BACK TO THOSE WHO WILL INVEST IT IN OUR ECONOMY. THEIR PLAN INCLUDES TAX REBATES FOR MANY FAMILIES WHO DIDN'T QUALIFY FOR THE EARLIER REBATE PLAN, ACCELERATES THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OTHER TAX CUTS FROM THE EARLIER PACKAGE, AND OFFERS NEW TAX CUTS DESIGNED TO PROMOTE IMMEDIATE INVESTMENT BY BOTH INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES.

HOW MANY AGREE WITH THE DEMOCRATIC ONE? 7. HOW MANY WITH THE REPUBLICAN MESSAGE? 3. LET'S TALK ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC ONE FIRST.

It seems like the odd thing is that the Democrats are being fiscally responsible and that's the reason.

They are coming across that they know the tax base that they need to cover to (inaudible) new spending.

I chose it because I get concerned that we are bailing out airlines, we are bailing out everybody. How much can the government handle when there is already a big deficit?

We've got the deficit, we've got increased spending, we've got military action going on, and don't really need to keep handing out money right now.

Exactly.

The ones that we really need to bail out the most, the travel agencies, they really need it bad. They wanted 3 billion. What a joke.

The postal service is asking for it next. Everybody is asking for money from the government. The government can't bail everybody out.

The Democratic one seems like more of a fairy tale, however, because they want to delay tax rates passed earlier, that somehow that will offset some of these other costs. I don't see that.

I don't think that will solve it. The idea of reducing taxes even more right now is wrong.

MODERATOR—WHAT ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN ONE?

The Democratic one didn't look like it was going to work.

My basic thing is that I believe tax cuts encourage spending, spending keeps pumping money back into the economy and just keeps it recycling. I get money back in my pocket, I'm going to go spend it at this store. The owner of that store is going to go spend it on this stuff and so on. It just keeps cycling. I believe I know better what to do with my money than the government does.

That's exactly my reason. Tax cuts and give more and give people spending.

MODERATOR—DO YOU THINK THAT IF WE CUT TAXES MORE THAT THAT WILL STIMULATE BUSINESSES AND INDIVIDUALS TO SPEND MORE?

After the terrorism thing, people are scared. It's not a fair thing right now. I think people are scared to spend money.

Some people are going to spend anyway. You give them the money and you will spend it. I think in general right now, people are going to be more cautious. They are going to spend some of it, but they will still hang onto it. I don't think it's going to boost the economy enough to justify the hit on finances towards things that the government needs to handle right now.

But spending is not a problem in my house, and talking to my friends, I don't know of anyone that is holding their money back because of what's going on. I just don't see it. It sounds good in theory, but I'm not seeing it.

My problem is that the tax cut for Joe Average or myself, it's such a small....talk about billions of dollars, here's your little piddly check, it's not material enough to make a difference for me. Maybe if I'm making \$300,000 and I'm getting \$5,000 or \$10,000 back, well yeah, that's okay. I don't mind that. If you get a couple hundred bucks back or whatever, it seems to me that the money just doesn't make that much difference in my life. You get \$100 back, are you going to say I got my \$100 and sock it away in the bank? You are going to go out to dinner and spend it. Does that make a difference?

If they do that one more time and everybody does that, well the restaurant industry would be ecstatic.

MODERATOR—LET’S GO TO HANDOUT #7.

REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS SAY WE NEED TO RENEW OUR COMMITMENT TO NATIONAL SECURITY. WE NEED TO DRAMATICALLY INCREASE OUR DEFENSE SPENDING SO OUR SOLDIERS HAVE THE MOST ADVANCED WEAPONS IN THE WORLD AND PUSH FOR A MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM TO PROTECT OUR CITIZENS FROM ATTACKS BY ROGUE STATES. WE’LL WORK WITH OTHER COUNTRIES AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, BUT WE NEED TO START PUTTING AMERICA’S INTERESTS FIRST AGAIN.

DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS SAY WE MUST PROVIDE OUR ARMED FORCES WITH THE RESOURCES AND SUPPORT THEY NEED TO FIGHT AND WIN THIS WAR ON TERRORISM, BUT SEPTEMBER 11<sup>TH</sup> ALSO REMINDED US OF HEROES AROUND US EVERY DAY. WE HAVE TO STRENGTHEN COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT AMERICA BY FUNDING THE RECOVERY FROM THE SEPTEMBER 11<sup>TH</sup> ATTACKS, IMPROVING OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM, PROTECTING OUR ENVIRONMENT, AND MAKING SURE EVERYONE SHARES IN THE REBUILDING OF OUR ECONOMY.

HOW MANY AGREE MORE WITH THE REPUBLICANS? 2. DEMOCRATIC STATEMENT? 5. THREE PEOPLE NEED TO MAKE A CHOICE.

I guess Democratic.

I would go Republican.

MODERATOR—SO WE’VE GOT 3 AND 7. LET’S GO WITH THE DEMOCRATIC MESSAGE FIRST, WHY?

What is that? What does that mean, a recovery of the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks? Improving our health care, certainly I can see that. I don’t like the word dramatically and Republican. Not that I like the Democratic, but I don’t like those words.

I looked at the Democratic message and said okay, if I remove the whole reference to Sept. 11<sup>th</sup>, it still sounds like the same message that I heard before.

Yeah.

I don’t know what it means exactly. That’s exactly how I felt.

MODERATOR—SO, IT’S JUST DRESSED UP?

Yeah.

There's nothing specific here.

Yeah.

I'm changing mine, I'm going Republican.

(many talking at once)

I also agree, who ever said the word dramatically. It's like more money than brains. Let's think about why we want to spend the money, and if it costs a lot and it's needed, of course, but if it is just let's throw more money at it, it's not necessarily the solution.

We don't need more \$1500 toilet seats.

Right.

I'd love to see one.

Making sure that there are resources to support the fight.

It sounds like it is trying to cover the economy, the military actions, everything, instead of focusing too much on one thing.

It's more domestic.

More of the issues that people were talking about prior to Sept. 11<sup>th</sup>.

Everyone shares in the recovery.

I like the idea of the heroes around us everyday and strengthening communities.

The thing I don't like about the Democratic one is that it is just saying spend, spend, spend, spend.

I hate that too.

(many talking at once)

MODERATOR—LET'S GO TO HANDOUT #8. I'M GOING TO READ YOU A LIST OF THINGS SPECIFIC GROUPS HAVE ASKED FOR FROM THE GOVERNMENT SINCE SEPT. 11<sup>TH</sup>. I WANT TO GET YOUR REACTION TO THIS.

Give a \$15 billion bailout to the airline industry, which goes entirely to the airline companies but provides nothing for the more than 100,000 airline employees laid off after Sept. 11<sup>th</sup>.

Permanently expand corporate tax loopholes like property depreciation and deferral of taxes on income earned overseas.

Reduce the capital gains tax rate, 80 percent of which goes to those earning more than \$200,000 a year.

Repeal a 15 year-old corporate tax and make the repeal retroactive for the entire 15 years. This means Ford Motor Company would be given a rebate check for \$2.3 billion, IBM would be given \$1.4 billion and General Motors would be given \$832 million.

Strict enforcement of patents so drug companies who make antibiotics used to treat anthrax and other potential threats could sell millions of doses to the U.S. government at full cost with any competition from similar generic drugs.

What do you think after hearing these?

Who wrote this? I can't see how anybody would support any of them.

It's the lobbyists.

This whole thing reminds me that we need to put some money into the war on drugs, because that was involved in some of these here I'm sure.

I still find it difficult to feel sorry for the airlines. I understand how important they are to the economy and to the country, but this question of how well the company was ran anyway, if they can go borderline bankrupt after three days....there's some important things happening after that, but we need to bail them out because they are crying wolf possibly?

**MODERATOR—WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT LOBBYISTS OR COMPANIES THAT ARE GOING BEFORE CONGRESS AND ASKING FOR THIS KIND OF STUFF?**

It's ridiculous.

They might get it.

They are leeches.

The bigger issue is that I think we all have a right to go ask Congress. I'd like to have another million dollars personally, however, the sad part is that congressional individuals will do things that gives them....they are financially motivated because of re-election. That's the bad part, not necessarily that groups will go in front of the Congress and ask for it. It's the leverage that they might have because they are willing to help the re-election campaign.

The last point puzzles me because the patents exist for a reason, and so I'm not quite sure why wouldn't you normally enforce patents anyway? I'm not quite sure where this one is going. Are they proposing that you drop the patents?

They propose to make it (inaudible).

There's a good (inaudible) going on right now with Canada. One of the stipulations with the patent says that you must provide the drug, and if you cannot provide the drug, then somebody else has the opportunity to create a generic.

My concern about that last one is geez, somebody finds a cure for cancer, where does it stop? If we open it up and say anthrax, we can break the patent, go ahead and everybody produce it. The next person comes in and finds a cure for aids, does that mean that everything that's up importance that we can start breaking patents?

It's the slippery slope problem.

That's my fear of that last one.

I know that the first one has already passed. Why didn't they buy \$15 billion in airline tickets to be used over the next so many years?

(many talking at once)

The President only gets to go to Des Moines.

Why didn't they buy them for the government employees to use over the next....we'll take these tickets and use them over time. To me, that's a good way. The government would get a better price than they usually do.

They'd spend a lot of time....a lot of this money is paying things like airport fees where the jets are sitting idle on the ground. Forcing the port authority's to negotiate with the airlines to reduce or eliminate some of these fees, to share in some of this burden.

MODERATOR—THE OTHER THREE ARE IN A BILL THAT PASSED THROUGH THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE AND IS NOW BEFORE THE WHOLE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BE VOTED ON, THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE THAT THEY ARE VOTING ON.

(many talking at once)

The way this third one makes it sound is that that tax repeal is only going to big companies. Is it going to smaller companies too, are they going to benefit from it, or is it just to the big conglomerates?

That's old news, a 15 year-old tax, that's happened. It's ridiculous.

It's 15 years ago. It's a done deal.

That was really insane.

Don't make it retroactive, and if it's affecting all corporations and not just limited to the IBM's, the Proctor and Gamble's, the Gillette's, the big massive corporations. If it funnels down to small businesses and small corporations, also, don't make it retroactive.

That retroactive part is extremely scary.

I don't like that too much.

(many talking at once)

All three of this are actually in lieu of giving direct aid to these corporations essentially. Financially supporting corporations through tax....

One of the things there too is permanently extend the tax loophole, like property depreciation. Depreciation has been around, it's not a loophole. If you buy property, you are able to depreciate it over whatever period of time. They make it sound like it's a bad thing. It's investing in new equipment, or is it just like....I'm not sure what it is. Is it land, I don't know.

I don't know either.

**MODERATOR—THERE WILL BE A CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION JUST ABOUT A YEAR FROM NOW AND POLITICS WILL RESURFACE AGAIN. WITH THAT IN MIND, REGARDLESS OF HOW YOU PLAN TO VOTE, WHAT WOULD BE THE BEST REASONS TO SUPPORT A REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE FOR CONGRESS?**

They are generally more pro business. I'm not a big business owner or anything, but you've got to encourage business. I think that's probably why I lean more towards that than anything else.

If you suspect that you can get a tax cut.

Tax rebates.

And you have an oil company that's going to drill in Alaska.

**MODERATOR—WHAT WOULD BE THE BEST REASONS TO VOTE FOR DEMOCRATS?**

I like to see

(end of side)

big problems, like the energy problem.

Probably a sound domestic policy.

The main thing is it sounds like they are getting more and more fiscally responsible. I don't know. They are more for the Joe Average and they are being more fiscally responsible than the Republicans. I don't know why.

It sounds like because they might not give you the tax cut.

If you are more interested in the deficit, and I am too, that would be a reason to support a Democrat.

I think we could all say we are more interested in getting the deficit down. I don't think any of us would turn around and write a check for \$300 or \$600.

**MODERATOR—GO TO THE NEXT HANDOUT. IF YOU WERE VOTING, WHICH ONE WOULD YOU CHOOSE? JUST GO AHEAD AND CIRCLE IT AND THEN WRITE DOWN WHY YOU WOULD CHOOSE THAT WAY. THANK YOU ALL FOR COMING....**

(end of session)